

PATENT
CFA-00006-US

REMARKS

IN RE APPLICATION OF:

Applicant:	Akihiro Ouchi	Conf.:	3512
Appl. No.:	10/658,958	Art Unit:	2629
Filed:	9 Sept. 2003	Examiner:	SHERMAN, STEPHEN G
For:	DISPLAY APPARATUS, METHOD OF CONTROLLING THE SAME, AND MULTIDISPLAY SYSTEM		

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	CLAIM AMENDMENTS	2
II.	INTERVIEW REQUEST	11
III.	STATUS OF CLAIMS (37 C.F.R. § 1.192(C)(3)).....	11
IV.	SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION (37 C.F.R. § 1.192(C)(5))	11
V.	THE GROUNDS OF REJECTION	12
VI.	THE ISSUES	12
VII.	THE LEGAL REQUIREMENTS OF <i>PRIMA FACIE</i> OBVIOUSNESS	12
VIII.	DISCUSSION OF CITED ART	13
IX.	EXAMINER'S REJECTION OF INDEPENDENT CLAIMS 1, 9, AND 16	14
X.	ARGUMENTS (37 C.F.R. § 1.192(C)(8)).....	14
XI.	CONCLUSION	16

II. INTERVIEW REQUEST

Applicant contends that the present response places the pending claims in condition for allowance, however if the Examiner is not so convinced, Applicant respectfully requests an interview to discuss any outstanding issues needed to place the Application in condition for allowance. The Examiner may contact Dr. John P. Keady at (703) 807-3055 in the Washington D.C. Metro Area at his convenience to schedule an interview.

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS (37 C.F.R. § 1.192(C)(3))

Claims 1-2, 5-10, 13-18 are now pending, Claims 1, 9, and 16 are independent. Claims 1, 5-6, 9, 13-14, and 16, have been amended.

IV. SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION (37 C.F.R. § 1.192(C)(5))

At least one exemplary embodiment is directed to an image display apparatus, comprising: input/output means for transferring image data input from a first image display device having a display unit, where the first image display device is disposed at an upstream location to a second image display device; acquisition means for acquiring resolution information of the second image display device; generation means for generating resolution information on the basis of the resolution information acquired by the acquisition means and a resolution of the display unit; first storage means for storing the generated resolution information; direction detection means for determining a direction, wherein the direction is determined by assigning a value based upon detecting whether at least one image display device connected at a downstream location from the first image display device is arranged in a vertical or horizontal direction and, wherein the generation means generates the resolution information by cumulatively adding the resolution of the display unit with the resolution information acquired by the acquisition means in the direction determined by the direction detection means; detection means for detecting a location of a present image display device in a multidisplay device system;

determination means for determining which part of the image data should be displayed by a present display unit of the present image display device on the basis of the location detected by the detection means; and display control means for displaying the part of the image data.

V. THE GROUNDS OF REJECTION

The Examiner has rejected all pending claims as follows:

(1) Claims 1, 3-9, and 11-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Furuhashi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,583,771) in view of Brenner (U.S. Patent No. 6,870,518).

(2) Claims 2, 10, and 17-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Furuhashi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,583,771) in view of Brenner (U.S. Patent No. 6,870,518), and further in view of Shirasaki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,943,753).

VI. ISSUES (37 C.F.R. § 1.192(C)(6))

The issues to be resolved in this response are:

(1) The rejection fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness of amended independent claims 1, 9, and 16, and dependent claims 5-8, and 13-15; and

(2) The rejection fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness of dependent claims 2, 10, and 17-18.

VII. THE LEGAL REQUIREMENTS OF PRIMA FACIE OBVIOUSNESS

To establish *prima facie* obviousness, all claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art and the asserted modification or combination of the prior art must be supported by some teaching, suggestion or motivation in the applied references or in knowledge generally available to one skilled in the art. In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988); In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). The prior art must suggest the desirability of the modification in order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. In re Brouwer, 77 F.3d 422, 425, 37 USPQ2d 1663, 1666 (Fed. Cir. 1995). It can also be said that the prior art must collectively suggest or point to the claimed invention to support the findings of obviousness. In re Hedges, 783

F.2d 1038, 1041, 228 USPQ, 685, 687 (Fed. Cir. 1986); In re Ehrreich, 590 F.2d 902, 908-909, 200 USPQ 504, 510 (C.C.P.A. 1979).

To establish obviousness based on the combination of elements disclosed in the prior art there must be some motivation, suggestion, or teaching, and the desirability of making the specific combination that was made by the Applicant. The motivation, suggestion, or teaching may come explicitly from the statements in the prior art, the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, or in some cases, the nature of the problem to be solved. In re Dembiczak, 50 USPQ2d 1614 (Fed. Cir. 1999). In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Examiner must provide particular findings as to why the two pieces of prior art are combinable. See Dembiczak, 50 USPQ2d at 1617. Broad conclusionary statements standing alone are not "evidence."

VIII. DISCUSSION OF CITED ART

FURUHASHI ET AL. (U.S. PATENT NO. 6,583,771)

As stated by the Examiner (Final Office Action, pg. 3, 15 August 2006) "Furuhashi discusses the input of the resolution of the display data to the controller of the image display devices and does not teach ...an acquisition means that acquires the resolution of the image display device..." (emphasis added). Additionally the Examiner states "Furuhashi et al. fail[s] to teach ...an image display device having a display unit, comprising: acquisition means for acquiring resolution information associated with the image display device disposed at the downstream location; and first storage means for storing the generated resolution information for supply to the image display device disposed at the upstream location..." (Final Office Action, pg. 5, 15 August 2006) (emphasis added).

Obtains IDs from "an ID setting circuit 129 holding ID numbers, i.e. identification data..." (Furuhashi, col. 5, ll. 57-59; Figure 1). "...an ID number, i.e., identification data, is assigned to the command included in the control data transferred through the control signal bus 132..." (Furuhashi, col. 7, ll. 10-12).

BRENNER (U.S. PATENT NO. 6,870,518)

Brenner illustrates non-serially, independently connected monitors (10a and 10b) that are connected to a Graphics Control 24 (Brenner, Figure 1).

IX. EXAMINER'S REJECTION OF INDEPENDENT CLAIMS 1, 9, AND 16

In rejection of independent claims 1, 9, and 16, and dependent claims 3-8, and 11-15, the Examiner relies on the primary reference Furuhashi et al., as allegedly disclosing an image display apparatus, which allegedly discloses most of the elements of the pending claims. The Examiner acknowledges that "Furuhashi et al. fail[s] to teach ...an image display device having a display unit, comprising: acquisition means for acquiring resolution information associated with the image display device disposed at the downstream location; and first storage means for storing the generated resolution information for supply to the image display device disposed at the upstream location..."

The Examiner interprets the ID numbers in Furuhashi as being given according to location. For example the Examiner alleges "the ID number i.e. value is assigned based upon the direction on the display..." (24 Jan. 2007, OA, pg. 5). Thus alleging that Furuhashi shows a direction detection means or a step of direction detection.

The Examiner alleges Brenner discloses the missing elements of claims 1, 5-9, and 13-16 not shown by Furuhashi et al.

X. ARGUMENTS (37 C.F.R. § 1.192(C)(8))

(1) The rejection fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness of independent claims 1, 9, and 16, and dependent claims 5-8, and 13-15

Argument Summary

The reasoning provided in support of the rejection of claims 1, 9, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Furuhashi in view of Brenner fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness. Generally, the deficiencies of the rejection are that:

- a. The rejection attributes certain claimed features to the primary reference Furuhashi that are not present. These features are also not shown, taught, or suggested in the secondary references.
- b. The primary reference connects displays in serial while the secondary reference connects displays independently, thus these references are not combinable so as to show, suggest, or teach a direction detection means or a direction detection step.

Issue (1) Argument

The Examiner has indicated that Furuhashi allegedly shows a direction detection means or a step of direction detection, and refers to IDs stated in Furuhashi. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiners statements.

Furuhashi obtains IDs from "an ID setting circuit 129 holding ID numbers, i.e. identification data..." (Furuhashi, col. 5, ll. 57-59; Figure 1). "...an ID number, i.e., identification data, is assigned to the command included in the control data transferred through the control signal bus 132..." (Furuhashi, col. 7, ll. 10-12). Thus, ID numbers in Furuhashi are supplied along signal bus 132, while the present invention can provide multi-screen display without the need of control data from the outside.

The Examiner states that the IDs are associated with positional location (vertical and horizontal position) (24 Jan. 2007, OA, pg. 5). However the Examiner offers no supporting evidence in Furuhashi to support such an assertion. Furuhashi IDs (102-1, 102-2) for displays are assigned in accordance with order they are attached in a serial manner (Furuhashi, Figure 1), not by any vertical and horizontal position. For the IDs values to provide positional information they should contain both a vertical and horizontal value, which they fail to do (e.g., 102-1, 102-2).

Additionally Brenner illustrates a non-serially display connected device (Brenner, Figure 1). Applicant asserts that the non-serially connected device of Brenner can not be combined with the serially connected device of Furuhashi to obtain a serially connected device with a direction detection means or a step of direction detection.

Clearly from the discussion above the Examiner has failed to meet the burden of showing that Furuhashi, even in combination with Brenner (which Applicant contests are combinable), shows, suggests, or teaches all of the features of amended claim 1, and for the same reasons as above, amended claims 9 and 16.

Claims 5-8, and 13-15, depend either directly or indirectly on amended claims 1 and 9, and for the same reasons as above, Furuhashi, even in combination with Brenner (although Applicant contests their combination), fails to show, suggest, or teach all of the features of claims 2, 5-8, and 13-15.

Accordingly Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

(2) The rejection fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness of Dependent Claims 2, 10, and 17-18.

Argument Summary

The reasoning provided in support of the rejection of claims 2, 10, and 17-18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Furuhashi in view of Brenner and

further in view of Shirasaki et al. fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness. Generally, the deficiencies of the rejection are that:

a. The rejection attributes certain claimed features to the primary reference Furuhashi, which the Examiner has indicated are not taught therein. These features are also not shown, taught, or suggested in the secondary references.

Issue (2) Argument

Applicant has already explained why Furuhashi in view of Brenner (the combination of which Applicant contests) fails to teach, suggest, or show all the elements of independent amended claims 1, 9, and 16.

Clearly from the discussion above the Examiner has failed to meet the burden of showing that Furuhashi, even in combination with Brenner (the combination of which Applicant contests), shows, suggests, or teaches all of the features of claims 1, 9 and 16. Additionally, the Examiner has failed to indicate where in Shirasaki et al., the features discussed above which are not shown by Furuhashi and Brenner are shown, suggested or taught in Shirasaki et al.

Claims 2, 10, and 17-18, depend either directly or indirectly on amended claims 1, 9, and 16, and for the same reasons as above, Furuhashi, even in combination with Brenner and Shirasaki et al. (although Applicant does not admit any of the references are combinable), fails to show, suggest, or teach all of the features of claims 2, 10, and 17-18.

Accordingly Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

XI. CONCLUSION

For all the reasons set forth above, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of all rejections to the claims. Because all claims are believed to define over prior art of record, Applicant respectfully requests an early indication of allowability.

If the Examiner has any questions concerning this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (703) 807-3055 in the Washington, D.C. Metro area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-

2456 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Very truly yours,

Canon U.S.A. Inc.
Intellectual Property Department

By /John P. Keady/

JPK/em

John P. Keady, PhD, Esq.
Reg. No. 56,389
15975 Alton Parkway
Irvine, CA 92618-3731
(703) 807-3055